FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism: Holding that Equality of Opportunity alone Constitutes Liberty; that in the Absence of Monopoly Price and Competition Cannot Exist, and that Communism is an Inevitable Consequence.

VOL. VI. NO. 43 SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1900. WHOLE NO. 283.

TO THE WORKERS.

Shall you complain who feed the world?
Who clothe the world?
Who house the world?
Shall you complain who are the world,
Of what the world may do?
If from this hour
You'd use the power,
The world must follow you!

The world's life hangs on your right hand!
Your strong right hand!
Your skilled right hand!
You hold the whole world in your hand,
See to it what you do!
Or dark or light,
Or wrong or right,
The world is made by you.

Then rise as you never rose before!
Nor hoped before!
Nor dared before!
And show as was never shown before,
The power that lies in you!
Stand all as one
See Justice done!
Believe, and Dare, and Do!

—Charlotte Perkins Stetson.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

MORALS OF MILITARISM.

We knew in a general way that slavery is "the sum of all villainies," while war is the multiplication of all villainies. But we did not expect to have it confirmed by so eminent a military authority as Sir Garnet Wolseley, in "The Soldier's Pocket-Book for Field Service," the primary object of which, as stated by Keir Hardie, "is to instruct officers how to transform a collection of human beings into a bloodthirsty, man-killing machine. And the soldier is instructed in the art of lying, cheating and stealing for his country's good."

On page 5 of this book is the following:

A soldier must believe that his duties are the noblest that fall to man's lot. He must be taught to despise all those of civil life. Soldiers, like missionaries, must be fanatics. An army thoroughly imbued with fanaticism can be killed, but never suffer disgrace.

On pages 165–6 is given the scale on which property taken from the enemy is to be distributed, in the ratio of 400 shares to the general, and so on down to one share for the lowest non-commissioned officer, privates not being in it at all, the total shares footing up to 766.

Another suggestive extract is this, on page 160:

As a nation, we are brought up to feel it a disgrace even to succeed by falsehood; the word spy contains something as repulsive as slave; we keep hammering along with the conviction that honesty is the best policy and that truth wins in the long run. These pretty little sentences do well for a child's copy-book, but the man who acts upon them in war had better sheath his sword forever. An English officer must make up his mind to obtain information as he can, leaving no stone unturned in order to do so.

Again, on page 167:

The means of starting an intelligence department should, if possible, be taken with you from Europe, or sent on before you. The purlieus of Leicester Square could supply our army with spies for every country in Europe.

Leicester Square is the headquarters of prostitution in London, and the proposition is to use these prostitutes as spies among the enemy to both poison them with disease and to gather information.

The Boers are freely (and falsely) denounced in the toady British press for firing on flags of truce. But, on page 300, Sir Garnet Wolseley explicitly defends the practice, thus:

Much nonsense is frequently written about the barbarity of refusing to recognize a flag of truce. It is the undoubted privilege of the general commanding the side to which it is sent to exercise his own judgment on this point; and should he not conceive it would be best to his advantage to receive it, should not for a moment permit any absurd and false ideas of humanity or sentimental notions about chivalry to influence his decision. Never for one moment suspend any movement or operation in which you may be engaged because the enemy has sent you a flag of truce.

General Wolseley poses before the W. C. T. U. of Canada and the United States as a temperance apostle. How easily these good people can be deceived appears when he advises, on page 299, relative to British officers who may be designated to carry flags of truce:

He should be warned on no account to accept any wine or intoxicating drink while in the enemy's lines.

Of course, he may drink all he sees fit elsewhere. But when the bearer of the enemy's flag of truce comes into British lines "he should be given plenty to drink, if he likes to have it, in the hope of being able to extract news from him when the liquor has untied his tongue."

Our military authorities are more guarded in expression, but militarism has the same meaning in every nationality and represents the concrete embodiment of every crime.—San Francisco Star.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

DISCORDS.

Teddy Roosevelt describes a disinclination to advance "civilization" by rapine and murder, as "cowardly shrinking from duty abroad." His idea of valor is exemplified in his own boast of shooting fugitive Spanish soldiers in the back. And his idea of duty—but that is a conundrum out of my range. It is, at any rate, something consistent with the vilest dishonesty and most loathsome cruelty toward weaker peoples.

◆ ◆ ◆

Cardinal Gibbons, who is in high favor at Rome, and speaks by the book, thus delivers himself in a recent sermon:

The holy spirit in the Old Testament, pays a beautiful and well merited tribute to woman and to woman's position in society. "Who shall find a valiant woman?" say the Scriptures, indicating that woman should be found attending to her domestic duties rather than mingling in the strife of the world.

What is it the holy spirit commends in woman? Does He admire her because of her triumphs, because she is a brilliant leader in society? Does He commend her because she is an advocate of certain so-called female privileges? Does He commend her because she goes about from place to place, ascending a rostrum and advocating the rights and privileges of women?

Not at all. The holy spirit does aver that she is simply a loving wife, an affectionate mother, a benevolent mistress to the members of her household. As the guardian of the domestic arrangements she is ever faithful. She looks well to the requirements of her household, and she does not eat her meat in idleness. She attends to the little things of this life, and she does them well.

This is always the spirit of the Church, although not always expressed with so brutal a frankness. Woman, as a meek slave, is to be trusted only with "the little things of life," and must never aspire to the unfoldment of a larger individuality. The great women of the world who have dared and done rise in a majestic host to confute and humiliate the insolent prelate. The only return the Church has to make to the self-denying services of woman is to bid her eternally efface herself, and be content with petty "duties." As long as she listens to the Church, she will be a slave.

◆ ◆ ◆

The editor of the United Mine Workers' Journal undoubtedly means well; but he does not know much—at least about Anarchy. Here are some of his silly effusions:

An Anarchist is a product—product of unequal and unfair industrial conditions. He is a man fully conscious of the existence of a wrong, but wholly ignorant of a proper or permanent remedy—an outlaw by reason of improper conception or a lack of knowledge of the higher estate of manhood.

After considering this question it is our conclusion that an Anarchist in the true sense of the word is of one of two types—either temporarily crazed, a kind of insanity peculiar to enthusiasts and especially profuse among those of a decided or extreme religious turn of mind.

A member of the "Reds" is the social boil upon the body politic and a cleansing and purifying of this body will finally remove almost all semblance of the eruption.

The only excuse for such misrepresentations lies in an utter ignorance of Anarchist philosophy. A few lines of our literature would have taught this editor better. He would be surprised to learn that Anarchism is not a mere outburst of indignation and desperation, but a well digested social philosophy, grounded on historic, economic, and scientific facts and principles; and that our aim is not destruction, but the elevation of the race.

◆ ◆ ◆

Bishop David H. Moore of the Methodist Episcopal Church has been assigned to Eastern Asia. Before sailing, he expressed himself to a San Francisco congregation on the issues in China, exulting over the war of invasion, in the name of Christianity. The following extracts, from the report of his sermon, need no comment. The yearning for the salvation of the souls of the Chinese, and the desire for "the treasures of her (China's) soil," are potent arguments against all conceptions of liberty and justice:

"I thank God that America, the infant of the nations, was ordained with the prophetic foresight symbolical of this country, to be the great arbiter of the other powers. I thank God that the policy of that great premier, John Hay, has been approved by all the other nations of the universe. All honor to old England. She is sometimes greedy, but we love her still.

Some say we ought to let the 'great yellow giant' slumber. The religion of the Lord Jesus Christ will not allow a slumberer on the face of earth. Its mission is to wake the sleeper. Christianity puts the ferment of truth into the intellect. This sleeping giant, yellow and worn by ages, has been disturbed in his sleep. Stand up, oh Yellow Monster, and answer for your misdeeds to the missionary martyrs of the world! Stand up and prepare yourself for the day of reckoning that must be yours some day, sooner or later. Your Flowery Kingdom, as you term it, is doomed to be a thing of the past!"

Over it all, said the speaker in conclusion, he saw the firm establishment of the religion of Jesus Christ. "The resources of China," he said, "are almost inconceivable. The treasures of her soil remain to be developed. China, the Flowery Kingdom, should be among the mistresses of the civilized world. That is her future. Civilization and Christianity will help to make it so."

Following the service, Bishop Moore said he would be glad to take with him a greeting and a "God bless you" to these as yet untaught people of the Orient. Whether it was a nickel or an eagle didn't matter. The rain of coin following this augurs much for the establishment of Methodist doctrines in the far East.

Bishop Moore is quite in harmony with many other preachers. Among these, is Rev. George C. Adams of San Francisco, who recently informed his people that "the Lord is a man of war," and that it was a Christian duty to spread the gospel with the sword. And this is modern Christianity!

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

In San Francisco.

A social and ball will be held in Turk St. Temple, 117 Turk St., Saturday, Sept. 15, at 8 P. M., the proceeds to be devoted to the revolutionary propaganda. All friends of liberty and fraternity are cordially invited. Admission 25 cents. Ladies admitted free.

FREE SOCIETY.

FORMERLY "THE FIREBRAND."
Published Weekly by Free Society Publishing Ass'n.

James F. Morton, Jr. ...Editor | A. Isaak.....Publisher

50 CENTS A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to **FREE SOCIETY, 236 Clinton Park, San Francisco, Calif.** For visitors off Market St. Castro car.

Anarchy.—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal: absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary

CLOSE RANKS, LIBERALS!

"The Single Taxers and the Anarchists are natural allies," said Bolton Hall, in a recent letter to Free Society. "I am an ultimate Anarchist," said to me a high Populist official in Kansas. "Our aims are identical, though our tactics differ," many Socialists have told me.

Now all these are sincere, and some of them doing good work along their respective lines. Not only these social workers, but Secularists, Spiritualists, Occultists, and many smaller movements, are battering down popular faith in the established institutions of the time. Between all these, there is a certain kinship, although the differences are very wide, and the eccentricities of some of the parties strongly marked. The one thing that they have in common is that all are moving, and lifting men and women out of the ruts of orthodoxy and conservatism.

It has been well said that there are a thousand ways in which a man may change his position; but there is only one way to remain in the same place. Hence the progressive elements must be expected to move in divers ways; while the conservatives stagnate after one and the same fashion. The one is the way of life, with its countless manifestations; the other that of death and decay.

Out of the manifold tactics proposed to us, for making the passage from the old to the new swift and complete, each must select for himself that which seems wisest, and firmly reject all compromise. But there is no need of tearing the throats of those who differ from us. In some things, we can work side by side with them; in others, loyalty to our own principles demands that we point out the imperfections in theirs. But a brutal intolerance is always out of place. There are good and strong men and women in the Liberal ranks, who by no means see things as we do. Though they cannot be our tent-mates, they are very far from being our enemies. They simply lack faith in our methods, just as we have no confidence in theirs. Nevertheless, in large measure, we are fighting the same battles. Every educational influence, which tends to shake men's confidence in the infallibility of the current religious, social, economic or political ideas and systems, represents just so much of a step forward. Every blow struck against what is vicious in existing conditions makes the remaining task so much easier for the workers, whose tactics are more wise, and whose insight is more profound.

Close ranks, Liberals! Whatever makes for progress must redound to the advantage of all that is sound in every progressive propaganda. Do not let our common enemies devour us piecemeal.

Charles C. Moore is a Secularist. He has little use for Socialists or Anarchists. But in the persecution which seeks to rob him of the right of a free press, your liberties and mine are bound up. Stand by the principle; and fight hard to save this man from the clutches of the blood-hounds. Close ranks, Liberals!

Max Hayes is a Socialist. He is arrested for denouncing capitalistic outrages. The enemies of the people think to silence him by imprisonment. Let every Liberal in the country join in indignant protest, and stand up to be counted on the side of fair play and free speech. Close ranks, Liberals!

At the present time, the Anarchists of the country are subject to a flood of the foulest calumnies. Already in Chicago, they are made the victims of the grossest police outrages; and threats are made to deny their right of propaganda in other cities. We have a right to look to all radical thinkers to render us the justice denied by the capitalist press. Were the Anarchist movement out of the way, the other progressive movements would find the same persecution directed against them. Advocating the most sweeping change, we naturally incur the most venemous hatred of those who are bitterly opposed to all amelioration of existing conditions. In defending our rights, the other Liberals of the country are defending their own. Close ranks, Liberals!

All along the line, the same principle applies. Where there is an outrage to be resisted, a victim of persecution to be defended, a protest against injustice to be made, a calumny to be refuted, Liberals of all schools should stand together as one, though not swerving an inch from their respective principles, nor ceasing to apply uncompromisingly the tactics which seem to them to lead most surely to the goal. There can be, there should be, a genuine fraternity among the Liberal and radical forces, in spite of the widest differences of method. Close ranks, Liberals!

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

NOTES.

A number of sample copies are sent out this week. A word to you who receive them. Perhaps you have never before seen an Anarchist paper. You have been taught to believe that Anarchists were a body of social and moral disintegrators, breathing out nothing but fire and destruction. Our aim is to convince you that this is not the case. We have a philosophy, which goes to the root, as we believe, of all social questions. You know that there is something wrong in society today. Men and women, the world over, are far from being in a peaceful, harmonious, and happy state. Is it not worth your while to examine into the causes of these things? Even if we are wrong, it will not hurt or contaminate you to study our theory, and learn why so many men and women face the frowns of the world in defence of what they believe to be a great truth. Even as a mere matter of curiosity, it is worth your while to make a closer investigation. Suppose you try a year's subscription to Free Society. It will not cost you much; and you will learn a great deal, even if you do not come to agree with us altogether. Should not a fair-minded man or woman read all sides, to know the whole truth?

◆ ◆ ◆

Our Italian exchanges come to us with several columns blank, in silent protest against the tyrannous press censorship, which prevails in that unhappy country. To those who know anything of the grinding despotism under which the Italian people suffer, it is not surprising that movements, carried on in an orderly and peaceful manner in England and America, are in Italy tinged with violence. It would be astonishing, if the case were different.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

CURRENT NEWS.

The war in the Philippines is still ended—for political purposes.

◆ ◆ ◆

The latest news from China indicates that the work of civilization is proceeding with great rapidity, along the lines indicated by Emperor Nero—I mean William of Germany. While the Germans are murdering unarmed prisoners, and the Russians are slaughtering women and children, Bishop Moore, Rev. George C. Adams, and thousands of other servants of God, are raising their pious eyes to heaven, and singing their *Te Deum* over these latest triumphs of Christianity.

◆ ◆ ◆

The latest political move is an endless chain of prayers against McKinley. This harmless amusement has been devised by the W. C. T. U., in the expectation of inducing the Lord, who is unchangeable, to change any previous determination he may have formed concerning the election. The reason why information is to be given the Omniscient, and influence brought to bear to coerce the Almighty, is not because the maladministration has been guilty of countless outrages on the American people; has held a four year's carnival of plunder, and handed over the American people to the tender mercies of the trusts and the national banks; has sheltered criminals in high station, and maintained the cause of the rich against the poor; has refused protection to the black man in the South, and shut up the white laborer in bull-pens in the North; and has caused the dastardly murder of myriads of human beings, in the effort to spread its imperial sway over millions of men who prefer to be free. The W. C. T. U. does not think it worth while bothering the Lord about trifles like these. McKinley's real crime is that he serves wine at his table on public occasions, like every president except Hayes. The dear ladies forget that Bryan is as little of a temperance man as McKinley; so that their cause will gain nothing, if their prayers are answered. Perhaps, however, they are praying for the success of the Prohibition candidate. In that case, we shall be interested in noting, next November, the exact political pull of the Almighty, as "a prayer-answering God." If Woolley is elected, we will admit the efficacy of prayer, and join the Church at once.

◆ ◆ ◆

Congressman White of North Carolina, is, paradoxically enough, a black man. He has seen a great light, and become thoroughly disillusioned. Says he:

I don't believe a black man has much relief in any political party. He must paddle his own canoe; he must think for himself and act for himself. Legislation will not help him.

He is quite right, and would be equally so, had he substituted the word "poor," or the word "laboring," for the word "black," in the above quotation. What he perhaps does not see is, that the logical conclusion is Anarchy.

◆ ◆ ◆

The European governments are still afflicted with the Anarchist scare. Of course a consciousness of their own crimes has nothing to do with the matter.

◆ ◆ ◆

The funeral in South Africa is indefinitely postponed, on account of the "pernicious activity" of the corpse in trying to swap places with the undertaker.

◆ ◆ ◆

For the crime of arranging to hold a peaceful meeting, and of protesting against police thuggery, Comrade Lucy Parsons has been fined fifty dollars in a Chicago court. Several other comrades, who were victims of the same police outrage, having been brutally clubbed according to the usual practice of the Chicago bluecoated ruffian, were let off with a reprimand, "wich," as Sam Weller would have observed, "wos werry kind, considerin' as how they hadn't done nuthin'." Chicago continues to maintain her unenviable record, as a city where free speech and fair play are strictly reserved for certain privileged classes.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

APROPOS OF MARRIAGE.

The intimacy of married life, today, often dulls desire, increases friction, strangles reverie, and murders spontaneity. And the narrowness and hard neutrality of home life frequently exert a pernicious influence on father, mother, and children. Undoubtedly, many men and women could love more than one of the other sex, loyally and happily; for the capacity to love in some people is gloriously redoubled when shared. A statute would be absurd which alloted to each member of society but one bowl of porridge each morning, or, but one toothache in life. And certainly, there could be added choice and experience in the relations of the sexes without increase of sensuality, since the love between man and wife may be more lustful than the love between one man and several women, or, one woman and several men. Beyond this, it is maintained by many, that if woman, instead of man, were held responsible for self-imposed states of motherhood, she would be splendidly developed by this responsibility. Woman, even now, seldom slips into the entangling alliance, enforced by Church and State, unless she is quite sure of the honorable character and financial resources of her lover; and with the institution of marriage done away with, she would not have to be more vigilant than she is at present, in avoiding motherhood before securing, to the best of her knowledge and ability, provision for herself and offspring. With the institution of marriage abolished, woman would, in every sphere of activity, obtain readily, at all times, the full share of wealth at present so generally denied her. With the institution of marriage abolished, love would be freed, prostitution diminished, pleasures multiplied, imagination stimulated, and women, in general, made independent, courageous, and wise.

WALTER LEIGHTON.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY.

Unrestricted liberty is the privilege of doing as one pleases whether good or bad. This, we see at a glance, is impossible in society. A man may go off and live by himself, and exercise unrestricted liberty; but the moment he comes among men, he cannot practice unrestricted liberty, except his practices are such as leave every other man free. A man may find a woman whom he desires for his wife; in the exercise of unrestricted liberty, this man might compel this woman to become his wife whether she wished or not, but to preserve equal freedom for both individuals, the desire must be mutual; or the liberty of one or the other restricted. Then again, a man might wish to take a wife, and not be able to support one; unless the woman is willing

and able to support herself, the man exercises his own liberty at the expense of some one who must support the woman.

Then again, a man declares that he has a right to have as many wives as he pleases, but unless he gets them without interfering with their liberty, and is able to support them, he deprives the women and those who support them of *their* liberty, in order that he may enjoy his. If a man demands liberty in sex union, he takes away the woman's liberty to the extent that his desires exceed hers. If their desires are mutual, but both are intemperate and wreck their bodies or minds, they take away the liberty of others, by compelling them in the name of humanity to take care of them. Then a man may no longer find a woman agreeable, and desire to leave her for another; unless the separation is mutual, and provision made for her, she is deprived of *her* right of choice, that he may secure his.

In regard to children, the case is still more serious. A man may declare that he has a right to have as many children as he pleases; but it is very plain that he has not the right of unrestricted liberty; he has no right to bring more children into the world than he can take care of; for if he does he interferes with the liberty of society, who must take care of these children. Then he has no right to bring children into the world under unfavorable circumstances, for he deprives the children of their liberty. This is the most cruel form of injustice, because the victims are entirely helpless, and cannot take a stand for their rights. A man declares that he has a right to do as he pleases with his own children; yet he has no right to exercise his liberty in this direction, except so far as he respects the children's liberty.

Carried outside of the family, conditions are still the same; a man has no right to exercise his pleasure in business, or in recreations that interfere with the liberty of others. If he must enslave others to enrich himself, or to furnish himself entertainment, he takes away from others that which he desires for himself.

From these considerations it is clear that unrestricted liberty for the individuals is impossible; but that the only liberty that can be maintained among mankind is such adjustment as provides equal liberty for all. To maintain that every man should be allowed unrestricted liberty, is simply to say that the strongest and the shrewdest may exercise their liberty, and make slaves of the rest.

The real question in regard to the exercise of individual liberty is here: Where shall we draw the line in restricting one individual's liberty to preserve the liberty of another? In a community, the ones capable of securing equal freedom for all, are those who love equal freedom for all. The old time idea of liberty, was for one man or body of men to claim and secure at all costs that which he or they conceived to be liberty, and then to proceed to compel—when they could not persuade—all others to conform to their idea of liberty. The practice is far from obsolete today. The highest idea of liberty that man has been able to comprehend, is to leave every man the freedom of choice so far as may be, and to exchange ideas freely. The insane, idiots and brutes, they would restrict in the exercise of their freedom, because they are not able to use it intelligently, and interfere with the freedom of others unwarrantably. The old idea of dealing with the ignorant has been compulsion; the modern idea is to offer them education, and to win them by illustrating the advantages of it in the lives of others.

When the modern idea of equal liberty is more widely established in the minds of men, we shall not find one body of men attempting to compel every one else to conform to their ideas, because they believe their ideas superior. The man who believes a certain method of education best for his children, will not seek to compel every other man to have his children educated in the same way; but he would wish others to have the same freedom of choice that he had. The man who believed in vaccination or a certain theology, or a certain method of cure, would wish the right to choose these things, and would not be found struggling to make laws to compell others to accept his ideas, but rather seeking to aid others to carry out their own ideas. And neither the man who believes the highest ideal of life is to live with one wife, or he who believes the better way is to have a number of wives, or he who believes in having one wife and several mistresses, will attempt to make his choice of life the rule for all, but will simply seek the right of making his own choice. In communities, whether cities or towns or colonies, only those will co-operate who desire to co-operate, and those who are willing to co-operate in a general way, and those who prefer to co-operate only in certain ways, will have equal privilege.

When the modern idea of liberty takes firm root, men will not only suffer each other to choose for themselves what seems to them best, but will aid each other to accomplish their desires. Every man who seeks to enjoy his liberty in choice of a livelihood, must be restricted, if he chooses idleness, theft or trickery; for these methods interfere with the liberty of others. On the other hand, every man should aid every other man to enjoy the liberty of getting a livelihood, which liberty is denied many a man and woman today. This is the first step to individual liberty; and without it can be no healthful progress. MABEL GIFFORD.

COMMENT.

The writer of the above has confused the word "liberty" with the word "authority" throughout her article, as we find so many people constantly doing when speaking of liberty. Liberty does not mean the right of subjugating every individual; that is authority. Liberty means "the state of being exempt from the domination of others." Authority means to "command obedience," which entails all the dangers the writer fears under "unrestricted liberty." Liberty is not a dangerous thing; but assuming that it was, history proves that it is always safe to trust man with as much liberty as he is able to acquire. ABE ISAAK JR.

* * * * *

CHORDS.

Constant Reader.—No, we do not credit the rumor you allude to. It may be true that the Sultan of Morocco, the Emperor of Abyssinia, and the King of Dahomey, have been in telegraphic communication concerning the Boxer outrages in New Orleans. But it is not likely that they have determined to partition the Southern States as an indemnity. The Sultan might be willing to take New Orleans and the Mississippi valley as a sphere of influence, but not even the King of Dahomey would be burdened with South Carolina. Besides, you must remember that the rulers mentioned are not Christians, and therefore do not possess any thirteen-inch guns, without which modern missionary work cannot be carried on.—Justice.

A Chinaman of great dignity and some splendor of dress was getting off an elevated train at 23d street the other day when a white rowdy called after him.

"Say," said the tough, "are you a Boxer?"

The other tough added some abuse and roared with laughter, after the Chinaman, who got off the car, then turned. He waited till the gates were closed, then he answered in pretty clear English:

"Say, you Clistian?"

Then the gateman and some passengers laughed, and the toughs slunk into the car.—New York Commercial Advertiser.

We are opposed to the government of ten million Filipinos without their consent. We are also opposed to the government of seventy-five million Americans without their consent.—National New Era.

Our praying machines must be set to order imploring God to aid in blowing all who object to being robbed into their original atoms. Christianity now demands the goods and chattels of the heathen Chinese.—The New Light.

It is only a step from using soldiers to shoot American ideas into brown men to using them to shoot American ideas out of white men.—Helena Independent.

A humbug will soon talk itself to death. Free speech and a free press is the best protection a people can have against a vicious doctrine.—Farm and Factory.

Mark Hanna knows how to be president without being elected.—Kentucky Free Lance.

* * * * *

A LETTER FROM NOME.

Thinking that a letter from this part of the world will interest the readers of Free Society, I will endeavor to give the impressions of a fortnight's residence in the land of the midnight sun.

Being of a Nome-adic disposition, I could not resist the opportunity of joining the great stampede of fortune hunters to try to enlarge the cross upon which mankind is to be crucified, according to Billy Bryan. After a very pleasant sea voyage of ten days, we arrived at Nome, the most unique city in existence. It is a city of tents, stretched along the shore of Behring Sea, for a distance of twelve or fifteen miles. In less than three months from now, the last of these canvas homes will have disappeared from the beach, at the warning of old Boreas. The exaggerated reports circulated by the newspapers of the richness of these diggings have attracted thousands here, who will have a hard time getting out before the setting in of the arctic winter. There is very little work of any kind. Disappointment is depicted on every face. They are now at the mercy of the steamship companies. What fools these mortals be.

The beach diggings, which are being worked over for the third or fourth time, are worked on Anarchistic principles. High tide mark is the line of freedom. "Man marks the earth with ruin; his control stops with the shore." There is not now, and I am told that there has not been, any dispute about rights on the beach. Everything went along harmoniously. Men worked side by side, without a look of envy or a word of anger. Sometimes, in the places that were richest, they were reaching for the same shovelful; and yet they did not need policeman or soldier, to prevent them from braining each other; or to say to whom it belonged. It was only when they began to stake out claims, sections that were considered richest, that the four hundred soldiers were brought here to protect the monopolists in their stolen property.

There are some things in life at Nome, that recall descriptions I have read of California, in the days of '49. The peculiar characteristics which gold-hunting develops are the same today as in the early times. Why some men will isolate themselves from society, and live for years in the wilderness and mountains, deprived of almost every comfort, sometimes suffering hardships beyond the power of men of ordinary strength to endure, is a study for psychologists. If all this extraordinary energy, witnessed in the life of a mining camp, were directed in some useful cooperative industry, how different would be the result, from the desperate despair that follows the first enthusiam of the gold craze.

In conclusion, I will say, anyone coming here without mercenary motives may be fully compensated for whatever sacrifices he may make, by what he will see at this gigantic exhibition of human folly at Nome City. T. SHEEDY.

Literature.

The Universal Illusion of Free Will and Criminal Responsibility. By A. Hamon. London, Eng.: The University Press.

The fallacy of free will is slow in disappearing from the human mind; although logically it has long been demonstrated to be altogether untenable. Its present supporters are mainly the mass of untrained thinkers, wholly unfamiliar with the scientific results of the present century, and more or less under the sway of religious superstition. To these, must be added the sentimentalists, who abandon the attempt to defend the doctrine, and merely cry out that its denial would involve disastrous consequences to society; or who hold that there must be a free will, because they want one. One other class remains, who uphold free will from dishonest motives, foreseeing that its rejection must logically involve the abandonment of punitive restraint, and the abolition of government. The work in question pursues each of these opponents of determinism to the last intrenchments. The author marshals an array of incontrovertible facts, and draws from them the inevitable conclusions. He deals a crushing blow, not merely to an already outworn metaphysical dogma, but to the whole current theory of criminology.

The only possible point of assault is the author's definition of crime as "every conscious act which injures the liberty of action of another individual of the same species." Space forbids an extended argument on this point, inasmuch as any imperfection in the above definition in no way vitiates the general argument. There can be no question of the superiority of such a conception of crime to the earlier definitions, examined and discarded by the author. I believe, however, that I could furnish strong grounds for defining crime, if the conception of crime is to be retained at all, and not merged into that of mental alienation, as "an anti-evolutionary act." An act whose natural consequence is to arrest development, or to reverse the process of evolution, is clearly criminal, if anything can be so. Slavery is a crime today, for the foregoing reason. It was not a crime, when it first came into existence as a substitute for the wholesale massacre of captives.

As a whole, the work is one of unusual value, and merits careful reading and study. The author, a lecturer in more than one continental college, is one of our own comrades, and editor of L'Humanite Nouvelle.

283

The number printed on the wrapper of your paper shows that your subscription has been paid up to that number.

WHAT MEANS ALL THIS?

For the past three or four months, I have had the opportunity of reading a few copies of your paper, and during that time, have looked anxiously for some writer to explain the ground reasons why Anarchists and free lovers object to the marriage ceremony; why they object to being tied up in a legal way, when it is a well established fact, that love itself is free; the contract made between the man and the woman is free; the law does not force any one to marry, only in cases where the man has deceived the woman by false promises. Would doing away with the legal part of the performance, make the man and the woman more true to each other? Does it change the chemical qualities of sugar—does it make it any the less sweet—if you get it from your grocer on credit, promising to pay him for it in due time? However much we may try to persuade ourselves that sugar is not so sweet because we may be legally forced to pay for it, it is not so, for the imagination has no power to change the chemical qualities of anything. If I have any love for the Arab before eating the salt with him, I shall have none the less after. To refuse to be bound by law to the one we profess to love is a plain declaration to that one, that we do not fully trust her, that we kindly think we love her, but may see another that will suit us better tomorrow. If I refuse to give my note, when I justly owe a debt, it is a plain declaration to that party and to the world, that I do not mean to pay such debt Is this not logical? If you have anything more logical, please trot it out? Wherein does the yoke come in, in the ceremony, in the wording of the license, or is the yoke found in the fact that you are, to a certain degree, compelled to remain with and be true to the one who has the natural right to expect this of you? The yoke cannot be in the ceremony; for this consists in the memory of words spoken on that occasion? It cannot lie in the license; for this is nothing more than an inanimate sheet of paper? Then, the yoke must come in your deception; you made the party of the second part believe that you loved her; and now that you wish to undeceive her by walking off and leaving her, you call it a yoke of bondage, because the whole community, through the voice of law, compel you to give good reasons for your conduct. "Morality demanding that the bride shall take a lie on her lips." In order to prove this assertion, you must first prove that there is no such thing as love; but the law compels the bride to say that she loves the man; and in this it forces her to lie. I had a thousand times rather the lie would continue to circulate, than to know that there is no such thing as love. The law of opposites proves that there is; and this law is worth all of man's thoughtless assertions. By this law, we can prove many things to be true, that are disputed by many who really think themselves philosophers. It is the law of opposites that makes it possible for man to exist as a conscious being; and this law points to an opposite in all things.

We read of the bondage of the family. What! Is it possible, that under the new order of things, there is to be no family? Who is going to take care of the children, under this great reign of freedom? Are the angels of heaven going to come down and take charge of them, thus leaving the father and mother free from all care and responsibility? This is about the only conclusion one can draw, from many of the articles I have read in Free Society. The man is to be free to make love, and copulate with any and all women; the child can never know its father; and we may rest assured, it will know its mother, and her tender care over it; or else it will never live to either bless or curse the world. If the mother is thus forced to nurse and tenderly care for her offspring, tell me why the man should not be forced to help care for his own children? If the women readers of your paper have one speck of sense left, they cannot fail to see in this so called free love, no love at all, but instead thereof, shame, misery, and sorrow, such as she has not yet known. If there is to be no offspring; or if there chances to be, they are put to death at the moment of birth; if this is to be the order, then there may no good reasons why men and women should marry. Please explain these matters; for I assure you, there is no one more willing to abide by truth and justice, than is the writer of this article.

If to believe that a man ought to be a law unto himself, constitutes an Anarchist, then I am one. Do you wish to know how long we have to wait for this good day? About one thousand years from the invention of railroads, the discovery of the power and use of steam. But this is a long time to wait; and while waiting for man to reach this station, it is the wisest thing we can do, to vote for the co-operative commonwealth. In other words, let us vote for Socialism out and out, and we shall have justice and equality, as much as the human mind can stand at present. Should beings come here from some other planet and do away with all man-made law, thus leaving the Anarchists free, terror would take possession of us; for until man evolutes to that plane wherein he becomes a law unto himself, he must be kept under by the fear of law. In other terms, in order to have Anarchy succeed, you must have Anarchists and none but Anarchists. The best proof we can have that it is good to compel men and women to live with and remain true to each other, in so far as the law can reach such cases, is the fact that there are many who are trying to throw off this yoke. The law was made for those who disobey the law. So long as a man does not commit himself, he does not feel the pressure of the law; to him, the case remains the same as though there was no such law. We make no apologies for those laws which oppress the poor and shield the rich; but if ever there was a good law passed by man, it is that law that compels a man to remain with the mother of his children, and help her to bring them up. The man who does not think more of his offspring than he does of the offspring of Tom, Dick, Harry and the devil, is a brute, and not a man; and those who wish man to be left free to deceive a thousand women, to go with impunity from one to another, and thus curse the world with his offspring, are making a plea for their own licentiousness and lust of flesh; they care nothing for women, only to enjoy the act of copulation with them. If it can be shown in a plain and logical manner that this is not so, then I will offer an apology for these accusations. But there are many other points to bring up; there is the law of opposites to bring against you; and when you have stood under this law for an hour or so, you are likely to conclude that you were born in the dark of the moon. We will let you off now; for there are many other wrong notions to fight; the free lovers and the Anarchists are only a handful of the many cranks in the world today.

Yours for truth and justice, though the heavens fall. FRANK REED.

COMMENT.

Since this "crank-killer" has so many other "wrong notions to fight," it would be a pity to trespass too much on his valuable time, and his limited patience. I feel hardly competent to emulate his courtesy toward those who differ from himself. We "cranks" have not yet learned the validity of the argument which consists in wholesale accusations of dishonesty and "licentiousness" against those who advocate a different regime from ourselves. But we trust to find some excuse for our obtuseness; we are only cranks.

It is not quite clear to us how "the law of opposites," the law of attraction, the law of gravitation, or any other natural law, requires to be bolstered up by man-made statutes. To our benighted minds, it would seem that these natural laws were quite capable of enforcing themselves, without the bungling aid of legislatures or policemen. But then we are only cranks.

In our school-days, we were taught that a stream could not rise higher than its source; and, having no "crank-killer" to teach us better, we were unsophisticated enough to believe it. A remnant of this childish superstition lingers with us, and renders it difficult for us to see how men who are unfit to govern themselves can be trusted to rule over their fellows. Please forgive us; we are only cranks.

It seems to us strange logic to insist that the repulsiveness of a law is an argument in its favor. This startling discovery should at once be made known to all legislative bodies; that the true method of procedure is to find out what laws the people do not want, and then to enact these at once. If we do not take the lead in the matter, it is because we are only cranks.

That free love means no love at all, is likewise news to us. We had advocated sex reform, under the impression that the union of sexual and economic freedom would free woman from dependence upon a man capable of "deceiving" her. We did not suppose that the cure for ill-assorted unions lay in forcing unloving relations to continue, and curse the wretched couple throughout life. Nor did an atmosphere of friction and hatred seem to be exactly the best environment for the rearing of children. It is very unfortunate that we are only cranks.

Our view has been that "the first right of a child is to be born well"; and that careless and loveless conception must of necessity produce prenatal conditions fatally handicapping a human being through his entire life. We knew that in all other matters, responsibility flows from freedom; and we supposed the like principle would hold in the sex relation. We knew no better; we are only cranks.

We lacked information as to the date of the realization of our ideals. Now that we know, on the approved authority of the "crank-killer," that it is about one thousand years hence, having some occult connection, (intelligible only to a "crank-killer") with the discovery of the power and use of steam," we may be able to accept the transcendentally logical corollary, that the way to attain our ends is to move with the utmost celerity in the opposite direction. It is interesting information, to learn that there is a limit to the amount of justice that "the human brain can stand at present." We had supposed that not even a "crank-killer" could set bounds to the development of the human mind; and that it was impossible to have too much justice. We ought to have known better; but we are only cranks.

If "the law was made for those who disobey the law," the crank would conclude that if there were no law, there would be none to disobey it; and that therefore there would be no need of law. The rebel appears at the same moment with the government. But then, this is only the logic of those who "were born in the dark of the moon." Alas! we are only cranks.

On bended knees, we thank the "crank-killer" for all the information he has imparted; and promise to reform our ways, as soon as our crankiness will allow. If we dare to make a humble suggestion to the "crank-killer," as he leaves our mangled remains behind, and strides triumphantly forward in his march against all the other cranks whom it is his mission to fight, it would be as follows: Try to learn something about the real teachings of those whom you seek to refute. Abuse is not argument; and exaggeration and misrepresentation are of small benefit to a cause. Even a "crank-killer" can afford to be fair toward an opponent. "The human mind can stand" that much justice, even "at present." We might enlarge further; but to what avail? Our words would be as idle wind; for we are only cranks.

RECEIPTS.

Please do not use private checks nor bank checks if you can avoid it.

The safest and most acceptable manner of remitting is by postoffice or express money order.

Eugene $2.50 Raymond, $1.50. Colletti, 70c. Sliverman, Marett, Wolffing, Lynch, Hyland, Ruedebusch each $1 Glusburg Maisel, Kelley, Langman Malmed, Badaines, Gardberg, Smith, Margolius, Hermelin, Toggenburger, Heilbron, Minwegen, Knehue, Johnson, Caterali, Corna, Gazette, Bisconette, Selles, each 50c Floquet, Abrens Brown Schwartz Schmukler, Rudash, Baron Rosenthal, Ulanoff, Rich, Cole, each 25c. Brownstein, 20c.

R. Rieger's News-stand,

1705 Market St.,

keeps Free Society, Free Society Library, and other radical literature for sale.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS.

The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Court.

—AND—

Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe and Schwab.

This book contains a half-tone picture of our eight comrades and one of the monument erected at Waldheim cemetery to the memory of those murdered by the government. This is the best edition of the book ever printed. It contains 168 pages.

Price 25 Cents.

MORIBUND SOCIETY AND ANARCHY.

Translated from the French of

JEAN GRAVE

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

Price 25 Cents.

5 copies $1.00. 10 copies $1.50.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

For Pennsylvania.

All comrades of Western Pennsylvania who are anxious to distribute *Free Society* and *Freiheit* among their acquaintances, can receive them free from the undersigned by request.

I have also the latest books and pamphlets published in Germany, England and America, for sale. H. BAUER.

Allegheny, 73 Springgarden.